DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 382 141 HE 028 342

AUTHOR Szeto, Wing F.

TITLE Perceptions of Faculty Performance Evaluation among Faculty across Academic Disciplines at a Selected University.

PUB DATE 10 Nov 94

NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Nashville, TN, November 9-11, 1994).

PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; College Instruction; Colleges; Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; Intellectual Disciplines; Research; Standards; *Teacher Attitudes; Universities

ABSTRACT

This study examined whether the perceptions of faculty members at a southeastern university concerning the present evaluation system varies across academic colleges. The Survey of Faculty Evaluation was distributed to all full time faculty (N=530) and the 129 usable responses were analyzed using discriminant function classification. Respondents were from the colleges of: (1) arts, (2) business administration, (3) education and psychology, (4) health and human sciences, (5) liberal arts, and (6) science and technology. The colleges of arts and business administration tended to be distinguished from the colleges of liberal arts and science and technology on a function defined largely by teaching. Within the function defined primarily by research and criteria of faculty evaluation the college of health and human sciences was distinguished from the colleges of arts, education and psychology, and liberal arts. Results generally support adequacy of three of the survey's subscales (i.e., teaching, research, and criteria of faculty evaluation) as discriminating among faculty in the six college subgroups. Results also suggest a general heterogeneity of faculty perceptions across colleges regarding the relevance of evaluation items to their settings. Attached tables present details of the analysis. (Contains 45 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 382 141

Perceptions of Faculty Performance Evaluation Among Faculty Across Academic Disciplines at a Selected University

Wing F. Szeto

University of Southern Mississippi

HE028 342

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wing F. Szeto

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, November 9-11, 1994, Nashville, TN.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Faculty performance evaluation has been a hotly debated and often controversial concept in higher education. The debate has heightened recently in light of a trend to require not only that faculty evaluation take place, but also that specific evaluative procedures be used. The purpose of the present study was to determine whether faculty members' perceptions of the present evaluation system used at selected university vary across academic colleges as measured by the Survey of Faculty Evaluation (SFE). Survey instruments were distributed to 530 full time faculty members of a comprehensive university in the Southern United States. One hundred thirty-nine faculty members responded. Data were analyzed using discriminant function classification. The relationship between academic discipline and the various SFE subscales was investigated. Implications of the findings as well as suggestions for additional research are offered.

Perceptions of Faculty Performance Evaluation Among Faculty Across Academic Disciplines at a Selected University

The performance evaluation may be the most crucial aspect of organizational life. Every organization must know how well its people are performing, from the janitor to the top executive. In higher education administration, there is probably no single personnel practice that arouses the responses of workers, faculties, or administrators as much as job performance evaluation. Performance evaluation is seen as the basis upon which administrators make a variety of personnel decisions. It is the means through which administrators in institutions express their expectations of employees, evaluate the manner in which employees fulfill these expectations, and furnish feedback to employees concerning their job performance (Martin & Bartol, 1991). Moreover, college and university administrators use performance evaluation data for various personnel decisions. According to Burchett and Meuse (1985), data may be used to determine merit-pay increase, promotion, participation layoff, referral, demotion, transfer, or discharge.

Teacher evaluation has been a much debated and often controversial concept in the 1980s and promises to continue to be so in the 1990s. In fact, Cohen and Brawer noted some 25 years ago: "Evaluation of instructors is often an inconsistent exercise, archaic, and in large measure, unrelated to apparent

purpose" (Cohen & Brawer, 1969, p. ix). Now, as at no other time in the history of education, there is a push for excellence, with indicators of institutional effectiveness often tied to personnel performance. Not only is there concern regarding the performance of newly employed faculty, but tenured faculty are being scrutinized as well (Bennett & Chater, 1984; Bevan, 1982). Any more, the question of whether faculty should or should not be evaluated is a moot point (Bennett & Chater, 1984; Bevan, 1982). However, there is a dearth of evidence supporting the viability of principles and practices related to evaluation methods. This is particularly discouraging considering, on both formal or informal bases, that faculty are continually being judged.

In Evaluating for Excellence, Andrews (1985) offers a generic, all encompassing reason for faculty evaluation: "to provide a viable and credible means of strengthening educational institutions" (p.1). Andrews believes that there are far too many incompetent teachers in American schools and that sound evaluation systems, properly developed and implemented, would address this problem and guarantee students their right to quality and excellence in the classroom. In a 1984 article, Bennett and Chater concluded:

> There is value in a systematic approach to the periodic evaluation of tenured faculty, and the forces requiring it will continue. Financial problems will not disappear, and the recent

> public attention focused on the questionable quality of elementary and secondary education is unlikely to dissipate before it shifts to higher education. Systems of post-tenure evaluation provide an excellent way to preserve the strengths of tenure while also allaying public suspicions about tenure and concerns about faculty vigor and accountability. Failure to address these increasing public concerns will inevitably increase the likelihood of external regulation. (p. 38)

Today, demands by the publics served by institutions of higher education cannot be ignored (Turner, 1986). Excellence must be demonstrated if these institutions are to survive. Moreover, consumers of higher education are demanding with increasing regularity that this excellence originate in the classroom.

Faculty Performance Evaluation in Higher Education

In higher education, some faculty members move into tenured positions based on administrators' and colleagues' recommendations, while others are denied continued employment. Ultimate decisions regarding promotion or termination of faculty reside with the administration within each institution or university system. These decisions have great impact not only on the lives of the affected individual faculty members, but also on

the institution as a whole; therefore, these decisions should be made only after careful deliberation based on sound judgement, supported by accurate information concerning the faculty member's performance.

Bennett and Chater (1984) comment that the goal of any procedure for evaluating tenured faculty must be to foster and maintain excellent performance. When properly executed, the faculty evaluation process also enables individuals and departments to examine performance in light of broad institutional objectives.

An effective and objective performance appraisal system is a valuable asset to an organization, minimizing the organization's risk of being sued for a wrongful employment decision. According to a study conducted by the Bureau of National Affairs in 1993, wrongful termination lawsuits have increased more than 100 fold during the past 10 years, and employees have won 64 percent of those cases brought to jury trial. The average award in these wrongful termination cases was $733,000.00, although it has not been uncommon for awards to be in the millions of dollars. Legal implications should thus be considered when selecting and implementing the appropriate evaluation procedures and criteria. As Holley and Feild (1977) have so aptly pointed out, "Informal means for assessing faculty and staff job performance will likely be found to be impractical, infeasible, and illegal. . . . [Thus institutional

administrators] must be knowledgeable of the legal aspects and questions concerning the use of performance evaluation procedures" (p. 428). Parkinson (1977), however, highlights that many organizations experience difficulty in grappling with the problems of deciding what kind of performance evaluation system to adopt, or how to improve an ineffective system.

There is a great value, therefore, in administrators learning as much as possible about faculty performance evaluation practices and procedures. By so doing, these administrators will become more aware of areas of concern, prompting corrective actions that will benefit the overall educational system.

Possible Benefits of Faculty Evaluation

Many authors unequivocably concluded that feedback is a necessary condition for improving performance. Evaluation data concerning a faculty member's teaching and related activities (e.g., advising students, scholarly productivity, committee work, community and university service) represent one useful form of feedback. If employed adequately, as Grasha (1972) pointed out, evaluation procedures can lead to the improvement of teaching and related activities, an increase in faculty and student satisfaction with teaching, personal growth and development of the faculty member as a teacher, and opportunities for faculty advancement within the system.

When used on a campus-wide basis, assessment procedures for faculty may also have an impact on the institution in other ways.

After an extensive one-year study of assessment procedures in America, Eble (1970) concluded that systematic faculty evaluation activity can: (a) act as a catalyst to provoke campus-wide consideration of the qualities that affect teaching and learning, (b) attract into the profession those who see teaching as a personal calling, and (c) allow students to help provide data as a means of participation between students and teachers. This kind of involvement by students and teachers in the teaching-learning process has the potential to enhance the quality of instruction. It may even give teaching a kind of dramatic interest which abstract discussion seldom affords. System-wide evaluation systems may also stimulate an institution by the assessment of teaching to clarify its overall educational goals, curriculum, and values. In other words, the evaluation of faculty performance may potentially have a direct impact on other areas of institutional concern.

Primary Purposes of Evaluation Systems

Determining the purposes of the evaluation system before it is implemented and continuing to communicate these purposes to affected individuals is paramount to effective evaluation design (Webb, Montello, & Norton, 1994). Evaluations that lack clearly articulated purpose(s) are essentially meaningless and contribute little to the accomplishment of the institution's goals (Stronge, 1991). In Evaluating for Excellence, Andrews (1985) offers a generic, all-encompassing reason for evaluation: "to provide a

viable and credible means of strengthening educational institutions" (p. 1).

Performance evaluation schemes can serve many and varied purposes. In answering the question 'Why do we need to appraise?' Parkinson (1977) suggests three possible performance evaluation objectives: to allocate fair and just rewards, to identify staff with promotional possibilities, and to establish a more effective two-way communication system.

The survey data analyzed by Gill (1977) and Locher and Teel (1977) indicate other purposes which faculty respondents from various institutions felt their performance evaluation schemes should serve. Specifically, the respondents viewed performance evaluation as a means for assessing training and development needs, improving current performance, assessing past performance, assisting career planning decisions, setting performance objectives, providing feedback on performance to employees, aiding human resources planning, and identifying employees for transfer and lay-off.

One basic purpose of any faculty evaluation system is that it should provide faculty members with some measure of how well they are performing in their positions so that they can improve their performance (Tucker, 1981). Typically referred to as a "formative evaluation measure," this type of instrument should be designed to promote professional development and improvement. That is, it should provide feedback to the person being evaluated

for the purposes of self-improvement. As Popham (1988) noted, "The decisions riding on formative . . . evaluation involve a host of choices focused on 'How can I do it better?'" (p. 270). Formative evaluation is only quasi-formal, and intimately involves the person being evaluated. Also, because its purpose is the improvement of performance, it may have several foci relative to the teacher's work in the context of the operation of the institution (Sperry, Plunder, & Drew, 1992). For example, the formative evaluation results may assist the faculty member in developing more teaching strategies, or administrator could use the evaluative results to develop remediation strategies for the faculty member.

On the other hand, Miller (1974) states that the overriding purpose of evaluation "must be to improve the instructional program" (p. 8). He recommends using the evaluation results to provide assistance, counseling, and encouragement to faculty members with deficiencies. Through the judicious use of feedback, the teacher will become more aware of his/her strengths and weaknesses and therefore be better prepared to correct any areas of weakness. Ideally, positive feedback will motivate effective teachers to enhance their good performance, and negative feedback will cause teachers much dissonance or dissatisfaction, which, in turn, should lead to behaviors and actions that will improve their performance and reduce their dissatisfaction (Tucker, 1991).

Another reason for evaluating faculty is to provide a rational, equitable basis for making personnel decisions (Miller, 1987). Performance evaluation for this purpose is commonly named as "summative evaluation," that is, evaluation conducted at the end of an activity or period of time and designed to assess terminal behaviors or overall performance (Webb, Montello, & Norton, 1994). Summative evaluation is used to make personnel decisions regarding such matters as contract renewal, tenure, merit pay, assignment to levels of a career ladder, and termination. As Popham has noted, "Summative evaluation has as its primary function . . . the determination of a teacher's competence--not the augmentation of that competence" (p.269). Summative evaluation is formal, somewhat infrequent, and focuses only on the person being evaluated. The individual being evaluated is normally not as involved in the summative evaluation process as in the formative process, and in many cases may only be informed of the results or decision (Sperry, Plunder, & Drew, 1992).

Other purposes of faculty evaluation that are mentioned in the literature include the following: to consistently relate faculty activities and performance to the institutional mission; to provide a basis for encouraging, recognizing, and rewarding superior performance (Andes, 1988); to facilitate understanding and communication between administration and faculty (Balch, 1980); to demonstrate accountability; and to justify the

allocation of resources within an educational setting (Stier, 1982).

Evaluation Criteria

After determining the primary purposes of the evaluation system, a logical next step in most evaluation processes is to decide what should be evaluated. This process normally involves the establishment of evaluation criteria. The criteria are usually stated in the form of job-related behaviors or competencies expected of the teacher, administrator, or other staff member.

Although the central academic functions of most colleges and universities are teaching, research, and service, any number of general criteria can be used in connection with evaluation of overall faculty performance. In Evaluating Faculty Performance, Miller (1972) suggests nine evaluative categories: classroom teaching, advising, faculty service and relations, management, performing and visual arts, professional services, publications, public service, and research. Among the nine criteria, he suggests teaching as being the most important.

Bain (1982) offers the following checklist of evaluation criteria: in-class performance, academic advising, supervision of graduate students, research or publications, and participation in workshops or seminars. Prodgers (1980) presents a model of a systematic faculty evaluation system which expands the traditional criteria to include instruction, research,

professional growth and development, student advising, university service, community service, administration and management, departmental service, and publications.

Utilizing a questionnaire developed in 1966 by the American Council on Education, Seldin (1975) surveyed 491 private colleges. Based on 410 responses, classroom teaching was the highest rated major factor (99.3%) in overall faculty performance as perceived by academic deans. Other factors included student advising, length of service in rank, personal attributes, and committee work. Minor factors included professional societies, public service, and publications. Similar results were yielded by Moomaw's (Moomaw, 1977) survey.

In another study, though classroom teaching was also confirmed as the overall preferred criterion, Bolden (1981) discovered that institutions with doctoral programs strongly favored supervision of graduate study, research, and publications as significant evaluation criteria. By contrasts, faculty at non-doctoral granting institutions favored classroom teaching, cooperation, and availability to students as the most important evaluation criteria. Moreover, McShane and Douzenis (1987) in their findings indicate that males are twice as likely as females to rate research and publication highly as criteria, that younger faculty are more interested in improving teaching style than older colleagues, that doctoral degree holders rate research higher than those with master's degrees, and that tenured faculty

feel classroom teaching holds a lower priority.

Whitman and Weiss (1982) reviewed the literature and concluded that although teaching, research, and service are the traditional evaluation criteria, service is actually given little weight in many institutions, and teaching and research are often seen as competing obligations.

As one of the major criteria of evaluation, teaching has generally been perceived to involve the presentation of knowledge, information, and ideas by methods that include lecturing, discussion, assignment and recitation, demonstration, laboratory exercise, practical experience, consultation, and audio-visual media. In an evaluation of the real effectiveness of teaching, the effectiveness as of each of these methods should be considered, as well as how the methods selected by a given instructor relate to the objectives of each individual course. Considering classroom teaching to be the most important among the major areas of evaluation, Miller (1974) suggests five types of assessment of classroom teaching: student evaluations, classroom visitations, review of teaching materials and procedures, special incident reports, and self-evaluation.

Corroborating the concepts of Miller, Centra (1977) finds merit in student ratings from the standpoint of faculty teaching performance development, but adds that another rating method, peer rating through classroom visitations, tends to lack reliability unless adequate time for classroom visitation and

training are provided. On the other hand, McLean (1987) suggests that some aspects of teaching can be evaluated by using such products of instruction as course syllabi, tests, and reference lists. However, Scriven (1980) argues that the key component in the evaluation process is the student questionnaire; he does not recommend colleagues' visits to the classroom, but focuses only on measuring the amount learned, or checking students' progress in similar future courses they enroll in.

Research, as McLean (1987) defines it, is the creation or expansion of knowledge. Obviously, contribution to the discovery of new knowledge, new educational techniques, and other forms of creative activity should be considered when evaluating faculty research productivity. Evidence of research and other creative/scholarly activity could include such items as published books, articles, and papers in professional journals, works for performance, papers presented at professional meetings, and current scholarly activity under development but not yet published/performed. Tucker (1981) points out that evaluation of research should include consideration of quality and quantity of productivity of both short-term and long-term research and other creative programs and contributions. Several studies (e.g., Creswell, 1986; Seldin, 1984) suggest that evaluators are increasingly relying on multiple sources of information for judging faculty research activity, with number of books, published articles in professional and quality journals, and

papers presented at professional meetings all receiving high marks. In assessing faculty research performance, the evaluator should consider the degree to which research is rewarded, the means by which faculty research productivity is enhanced, the criteria to be used for evaluating research, and the specific steps to be used in reviewing research. A variety of qualitative and quantitative measures and weights should be jointly used to reduce bias.

But, in general, the evaluation of research and scholarship depends very much on the type of department and the level of institution. Centra (1977), who surveyed department heads from 134 institutions (mainly universities), indicated peer judgements of research and the number of articles in quality journals were important in social science departments in the research universities but not in social science departments in the comprehensive universities and colleges. Also, the number of books and papers produced was especially important in humanities departments at research universities and doctoral-granting universities, but not in the comprehensive universities and colleges. Centra (1977) concluded that the criteria used to evaluate research and scholarship should be set at the department level rather at the institutional level or by the discipline as a whole, since departments frequently have discipline-specific ideas regarding what constitutes quality scholarship.

Institutional service generally includes such areas as

involvement in department, college, and university committees, councils, and senates; service in appropriate professional organizations; involvement in organizing and implementing meetings, conferences, and workshops; participation in different media; and service in local, state, and national government and other agencies. Tucker (1981) notes that the major considerations when evaluating institutional service are contribution to the orderly and effective functioning of the academic administrative unit (program, department, school, college) and the whole institution, contribution to the university community, and contribution to local, state, regional, and national communities, including scholarly and professional associations.

One of the few studies that sampled faculty perceptions of evaluation procedures found that the most influential factors in promotions and tenure decisions were publications, the department head's evaluation, and student ratings (Thorne, Scott, & Beaird, 1976). This study, which was conducted at institutions in the Oregon State system, also reported that grant support was considered to be influential in the physical science departments although not necessarily so in other university departments.

However, faculty performance evaluation criteria might be viewed quite differently in different fields of study. In a study of department heads' perceptions of evaluation criteria, Centra (1977) found that there were differences in emphasis on

each criterion according to department. Publications (quality and number) were more important in the natural and social sciences than in the professional schools and the humanities. Student advising, public service, and consultation were given more weight in the professional departments than in departments of social sciences, humanities and natural sciences.

In a study which investigated the perceptions of faculty members of baccalaureate nursing programs in the state of Michigan, Johnson (1990) found that faculty considered classroom teaching evaluated by systematic student ratings as the major factor always used in teaching evaluation. The majority of programs always used publication in journals for scholarship evaluation. Moreover, institutions ranked college-wide committee participation as the most frequently used source of information in evaluating service performance.

Who Evaluates the Faculty?

There are ground rules which appear to be essential to "successful" performance appraisal. First, the evaluation must be based on job standards. Second, the evaluation instrument must be acceptable to both the rater and ratee. Acceptability can be enhanced by involving both parties in the development of the assessing procedures (Clayton & Gatewood, 1981). Additionally, the rater needs to feel confident in his or her position as assessor, be trained adequately in the use of the tool, and have first-hand knowledge of, or direct experience

with, the ratee (Spool, 1978).

Cummings and Schwab (1973) identify five sources for obtaining raters, of which four sources have been widely used in higher education institution. First is the immediate supervisor of the employee, the traditional and most commonly employed evaluator. Next, peers may be involved in the rating process. A third source of evaluation is the self-appraisal. It has been suggested that this type of evaluation is appropriate for use in employee development and counseling. Another source used for self-development is assessment by subordinates. This approach has been widely used in universities, with faculty-student evaluations serving as the most typical process of this type.

Corroborating with Cummings and Schwab's (1973) concept, in colleges and universities, evaluation of faculty performance is usually derived from some or all of the following sources: the faculty member's chairperson and other administrators, the faculty member's self-evaluation, the faculty member's peers, professional colleagues at other universities, student evaluations, contract plans, secret committees, statistical evidence, evaluation specialists, alumni ratings, and others (Tucker, 1991). These various sources of evaluation usually are paired to three or four major ones (generally administrators, colleagues, students, and self-evaluation).

Seldin (1989) found, over the 10-year survey period of 1978-1988, administrator evaluations were consistently the major

source of information on teaching performance, although student evaluations, however, have moved from third place to a virtual tie for first with chair evaluations in appraising teaching performance (Seldin, 1989). Self-evaluation and evaluation by colleagues were used in about half of all evaluations. Seldin concluded that colleges now emphasize a wider range of factors in the search for more accurate and in-depth evaluations of faculty performance.

In a similar study, Stier (1982) discovered that the four types of evaluation methods most typically used were self-evaluation, administrative evaluation, peer ratings, and student evaluation, with the most common system involving a combination of student and administrative evaluation. The next most common system involved all four methods combined. The results of Stier's study are similar to Seldin's findings in that administrative and student evaluation methods were evident in a vast majority of institutions and that self-evaluation and peer evaluation were used in close to one-half of the institutions surveyed.

According to Whitman and Weiss (1982), "If there exists one conventional wisdom in the field of faculty evaluation, it is that using multiple data sources is desirable." Likewise, Kronk and Shipka (1980) contend that a combination of methods provides a check-and-balance system.

University administrators, then, are an important source of

teacher evaluation information and are usually responsible for the ultimate evaluation. Thus, administrators are expected to gather and consider such information as course enrollment factors, appraisal of course load, records of institutional and community service, improvement patterns, and course and department marketability (Whitman & Weiss, 1982).

One of the most controversial issues related to faculty evaluation is the role of student as a faculty evaluator. Based on a meta-analytic study of student evaluation of faculty, Cohen (1980) concluded that although there might be some limitations to using student evaluations for making administrative personnel decisions, there is generally little controversy over their use for purposes of improving instruction. Likewise, in another study Piland (1984) concluded that neither students, faculty, nor administrators supported the concept of merit pay tied to student evaluation of instruction. However, in a recent study (Arden, 1989), combined peer and student evaluations were deemed as credible and valuable for this purpose.

Due to the numerous economic, social, political, and legal expectations previously noted, the evaluation of teachers should be accepted as a practical reality. With this in mind, the task then becomes to formulate and implement the evaluation system in such a manner as to maximize positive outcomes and to minimize any negative consequences. An evaluation program that is uniformly and equitably administered will serve as an effective

means for judging performance/behavior. An important goal of educational institutions in the future, then, should be the construction of comprehensive, objective, individualized, systematic, public, and fair personnel evaluation systems that are consistent with the law and cost effective for that particular institution.

Methodology

The purpose of the present study was to determine whether faculty members' perceptions of the present evaluation system used at a selected university vary across academic colleges. In order to achieve this purpose, a 78-item instrument titled "Survey of Faculty Evaluation" (SFE) was developed. Thirty-seven questions which were designed by Turner (1986) to measure the faculty members' perceptions of faculty evaluation in public junior colleges and 34 questions which were designed by Centra (1977) to investigate department practices in evaluating faculty performance were employed in the questionnaire being used in the present study. The instrument yields five subscale scores, namely, purposes of faculty evaluation ("purpose"), criteria of faculty evaluation ("criteria"), approaches of evaluating faculty's teaching performance ("teaching"), approaches of evaluating faculty members' scholarship or research performance ("research"), and uses of faculty evaluation ("uses").

Survey instruments were mailed to 530 full time faculty members of a comprehensive university in the Southern United

States. This sample constituted the total full-time faculty members population of the university. One hundred thirty-nine faculty responded. Of these, ten instruments were unusable, leaving 129 usable survey instruments which represented a 24% return rate. The questionnaire respondents represented about 70 different academic disciplines.

For purposes of analysis, the different academic departments were grouped into six departmental subgroups according to the classification developed by the university. The six departmental subgroups are: (a) arts, which includes all fine arts, music, and dramatic arts; (b) business administration, which includes business, professional accountancy, and economics; (c) education and psychology, includes teacher education, technology education, curriculum and instruction, educational leadership and research, psychology, and special education; (d) health and human sciences, includes home economics, human performance and recreation, nursing, and social work; (e) liberal arts, includes communication, library science, anthropology and sociology, criminal justice, all languages and literature, geography, history, philosophy and religion, political science, and speech; and (f) science and technology: includes all of the biological sciences, chemistry, physics, geology, mathematics, engineering, computer science, statistics, medical technology, and marine science.

Of the 129 respondents, there were 7 respondents from the college of arts, 12 from the college of business administration, 25 from the college of education and psychology, 26 from the college of health and human sciences, 27 from the college of liberal arts, and 24 from the college of science and technology. Discriminant function classification analysis was used to determine whether the five SFE subscale scores could be effectively used to distinguish group membership according to the departmental categories.

Findings

Discriminant Analysis Results

A breakdown of the means for subjects on the five SFE subscale scores across the six academic colleges is presented in Table 1. The means for both colleges of arts and business administration cohorts are lowest for purpose; colleges of education and psychology, health and human science, liberal arts, and science and technology are lowest for research. However, it should be noted that the means of all the six colleges cohorts are consistently highest for teaching. (Note: A low score reflects a propensity close to "always" while a high score reflects a propensity close to "never.") These subscale scores served as the discriminating variables used to classify subjects according to the six academic colleges. A discriminant analysis was performed using the SPSSx DISCRIMINANT procedure.

Insert Table 1 about here

The analysis yielded five canonical discriminant functions. Summary statistics for these functions are presented in Table 2. Cannonical correlations for the five functions show a moderate degree of correlations using the first two sets of weights (R = .34; R = .25), a minimal degree of correlation using the third and fourth sets of weights (R = .20; R = .10), and only a negligible degree of correlation using the fifth set of weights (R = .04). The magnitude of the first two canonical function suggests the usefulness of the instrument in predicting group membership.

Wilk's lambda serves as a useful statistic for determining the degree of correlations between two sets of variables in a multivariate analysis. Lambda values for Functions I & II, respectively, were .784 (not statistically significant) and .887 (not statistically significant) indicating that the dependent variables were correlated approximately 21.6% with academic college for Function I and 11.3% for Function II. The remaining functions accounted for only a negligible amount of correlation; hence, they were not interpreted.

Standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients and structure coefficient are presented in Table 3. An inspection of structure coefficients indicates that Function I

and II capitalizes on one variable and one combination of variables respectively in forming the discriminant function weights. Function I is defined largely by teaching, while Function II is defined primary by research and criteria. Considering the previous inspection of the cohort means (Table 2), it is not surprising that teaching is the best discriminating variable.

Insect Tables 2 and 3 about here

Furthermore, a plot of the group centroids on the discriminant axes (i.e., Functions I and II) indicate the college of arts and the college of business administration tended to be distinguished from the college of liberal arts and the college of science and technology in the Function I dimension. Within the Function II dimension, however, it appeared that the college of health and human sciences was distinguished from the college of arts, the college of education and psychology, and the college of liberal arts.

Classification Analysis

Results of the discriminant classification analysis are presented in Table 4. The overall "hit" rate of approximately 24% indicates that a better-than-chance although not an impressive rate of accuracy in appropriately classifying individuals associated with the six academic colleges based on

their perceptions of FES items. Among the six academic disciplines, the college of science and technology was classified relatively well, having a hit rate of 45.8%. The relatively low hit rate of other colleges suggests that there is a heterogeneity of perceptions among persons in those colleges regarding the relevance of the FES items to their settings.

Insect Table 4 about here

Discussion

The foregoing analysis has provided at least some evidence that three of the FES subscales (i.e. teaching, research and criteria) are adequate discriminating variables among faculty in six college subgroups. It should be noted that the means of the teaching subscale across the six academic colleges are all fairly high, indicating that many of the methods for evaluating teaching included on the teaching subscale were indicated to occur less than "frequently" (i.e., mean ratings for many items were greater than 2.5). These findings may suggest that the current criteria used for evaluating faculty's teaching performance in the six departmental subgroups may need to be reviewed. Considering teaching is generally the most important among the major areas of evaluation (Miller, 1974), it may be worthwhile to investigate the approaches used in evaluating faculty's teaching performance in the six colleges and consider using additional criteria for

rating teaching competence. On the other hand, the uses of research and criteria subscales are well utilized in most of these colleges.

Considering the comparatively low level of accuracy on classifying individuals associated with college subgroups, it is clear that there was a heterogeneity of perceptions among persons in several of those groups. The reason for this heterogeneity may be the variety of academic disciplines housed within certain colleges. For example, some humanities fields, such as philosophy and religion and speech, and social science fields, such as geography and history, were categorized under the college of arts, while some professional fields such as engineering, business, and education were grouped under the colleges of science and technology, business administration, and education and psychology, respectively. Further investigation of the faculty's perception of performance evaluation across departmental discipline is suggested, since faculty performance might be viewed quite differently in specific fields of study. Moreover, it may be more appropriate to group the faculty respondents according to their fields of interest irrespective of formal academic categories. Groups such as humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and professional fields might be more logical. By utilizing these grouping strategies, accuracy of classification and subgroups' discriminant ability could potentially be improved.

References

Andes, J. (1988). Resources and guidelines for effective evaluation. Charleston, WV: West Virginia Board of Regents. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 296 677)

Andrews, H. A. (1985). Evaluating for excellence. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.

Arden, E. (1989). Who should judge the faculty ? College Board Review, 152, 36-39.

Bain, G. (1982). Evaluating teaching: Purposes,methods, and policies Research, Washington University, Seattle, WA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 187 285)

Balch, P. M. (1980). Faculty evaluation in higher education: A review of court cases and implications for the 1980s. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 187 285)

Bennett, J. B., & Chater, S. S. (1984). Evaluating the performance of tenured faculty members. Educational Record, 65(2), 38-41.

Bevan, J. M. (1982). The chairperson: Product of socialization or training. In G. French-Lazovik (Ed.), Practices that improve teaching evaluation (pp. 19-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolden, S. H. (1981, March). The policies for the evaluation of tenured faculty in Alabama's public colleges. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document

Reproduction Service No. ED 203 814)

Burchett, S. R., & De Meuse, K. P. (1985). Performance appraisal and the law. Personnel, 62, 29-37.

Centra, J. A. (1977). How universities evaluate faculty performance: A survey of department heads. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ. (GRE Board Research Report GREB No. 75 5bR)

Clayton, K., & Gatewood, R. (1981). The development of a managerial performance appraisal system in a social service agency. Public Personnel Management Journal, 10, 261-269.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1969). Measuring faculty performance. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Cohen, P. A. (1980). Effectiveness of student-rating feedback for improving college instruction: A meta-analysis of findings. Research in Higher Education, 13(4), 321-341.

Creswell, J. W. (1986), Concluding thoughts: Observing, promoting, evaluating, and reviewing research performance. New Directions for Institutional Research, 13(2), 87-102.

Cummings, L. L., & Schwab, D. P. (1973). Performance in organizations: Determinants and appraisal. Glenview, Ill: Scott, Foresman & Company.

Eble, K. (1970). The recognition and evaluation of teaching. Salt Lake City: Project to Improve College Teaching.

Gill, D. (1977). Towards more open performance appraisal.

Personnel Management, 9(12), 31-33.

Grasha, T. (1972). Principles and models for assessing faculty performance. In Teaching-Learning Monograph Series. Cincinnati, OH: Institute for Research and Training in Higher Education, University of Cincinnati.

Holley, W. H., & Feild, H. S. (1977). The law and performance evaluation in education: A review of court cases and implications for use. Journal of Law and Education, 6, 427-448.

Johnson, M. A. (1990). Faculty performance evaluation: Perceptions of faculty and administrators in baccalaureate nursing programs in Michigan. (Doctoral Dissertation, Wayne State University): Dissertation Abstracts Intentional, 51(4), 1133.

Kronk, A. K., & Shipk, T. A. (1980). Evaluation of Faculty in higher education. Washington: National Education Association.

Locher, A. H., & Tell, K. S. (1977). Performance appraisal: A survey of current practices. Personnel Journal, 56(5), 245-247.

Martin, D. C., & Bartol, K. M. (1991). The legal ramifications of performance appraisal: An update. Employee Relations Law Journal, 12(17), 257-286.

McLean, J. E. (1987). A useful university departmental evaluation system. Paper presented at the annual meeting of

the American Evaluation Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 296 661)

McShane, K., & Douzenis, C. (1987, November). Evaluation and reward: Is research the only way? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile, AL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 290 374)

Miller, R. I. (1972). Evaluating faculty performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, R. I. (1974). Developing programs for faculty evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, R. I. (1987). Evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure. The Jossey Bass Higher Education Series, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moomaw, W. E. (1977). Practices and problems in evaluating instruction. In J. A. Centra (Ed.), New directions for higher education (pp. 77-92). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Parkinson, R. (1977). Recipe for a realistic appraisal system. Personnel Management, 9(11), 37-40.

Piland, W. E. (1984). Student evaluation of instruction: Perceptions of community college students, faculty, and administrators. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 8, 115-125.

Popham, W. J. (1988). The dysfunctional marriage of formative and summative teacher evaluation. Journal of Personnel

Evaluation in Education, 1, 269-273.

Prodegers, S. B. (1980). Toward systematic faculty evaluation. Regional Spotlight, 13(2), 1-19. Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, GA.

Scriven, M. (1980). The evaluation of college teaching (Professional Development Occasional paper No. 3). National Council of States on Inservice Education, Syracuse, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 729)

Seldin, P. (1975). How to evaluate professors. New York: Blythe-Pennington.

Sperry, D. J., Pounder, D. G., & Drew, C. J. (1992). Educator evaluation and the law: A case study of common statutory problems. Education Law Quarterly, 1, 415-429.

Spool, M. D. (1978). Training programs for observers of behavior: A review. Personnel Psychology, 31, 853-888.

Stier, W. F. (1982, April). Faculty evaluation: A positive approach. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, Houston, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 119)

Stronge, J. H. (1991). The dynamics of effective performance evaluation systems in education: Conceptual, human relations, and technical domains. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 5, 77-83.

Thorne, G. L., Scott, C. S., & Beaird, J. H. (1976). Assessing

faculty performance: Final project report. Monmouth, OR: Oregon State System of Higher Education, Teaching Research Division.

Tucker, A. (1981). Chairing the academic department. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Tucker, K. H. (1991). A case study of the formulation and implementation of a faculty performance evaluation system at a small southern university. (Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Alabama). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52(7), 2364.

Turner, C. B. (1986). Performance evaluation of faculty in public junior colleges in Alabama. (Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Alabama). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47(10), 3682.

Webb, L. D., Montello, P. A., & Norton, M. S. (1994). Human resources administration (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan College Publishing Company.

Whitman, N., & Weiss, E. (1982). Faculty evaluations:The use of explicit criteria for promotion, retention, and tenure. (AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 2). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 148)

Table 1
FES Subscale Means And Standard Deviation Across Six Colleges

EFS SUBSCALE MEANS

COLLEGE*	PURPIS	CRITIS	TEACIS	RESIS	USESIS
1	25.71429	27.78571	40.50000	26.92857	31.92857
2	24.12500	26.95833	39.54167	24.66667	28.66667
3	25.94000	28.68000	41.52000	24.20000	29.14000
4	25.40385	25.80769	38.84615	21.34615	28.65385
5	27.53704	29.70370	41.88889	23.66667	30.90741
6	27.04167	28.62500	43.27083	22.18750	31.56250
TOTAL	26.20661	28.05785	41.11983	23.27273	30.02479

EFS SUBSCALE STANDARD DEVIATION

COLLEGE*	PURPIS	CRITIS	TEACIS	RESIS	USESIS
1	6.83043	6.28396	7.25144	7.73751	8.92762
2	6.04575	6.73680	7.16512	7.36803	2.42462
3	5.82795	4.79122	5.14676	5.95119	5.21320
4	7.23605	6.61676	5.20916	7.04950	7.93822
5	4.57402	4.58312	6.64966	7.16562	4.29901
6	6.44865	6.20352	4.33635	6.38751	4.97671
TOTAL	6.08505	5.80954	5.82703	6.82489	5.78390

*Note: College 1 - arts, 2 - business administration, 3 - education and psychology, 4 - health and human sciences, 5 - liberal arts, 6 - science and technology.

Table 2
Canonical Discriminant Functions

FCN	EIGEN VALUE	PCT OF VAR	CUM PER	CAN CORR	AFTER FCN	WILKS' LAMBDA	CHSQUARE	DF	SIG
					: 0	.7842	27.827	25	.3159
1*	.1308	51.46	51.46	.3401	: 1	.8868	13.756	16	.6169
2*	.0691	27.17	78.63	.2542	: 2	.9480	6.111	9	.7287
3*	.0426	16.77	95.40	.2022	: 3	.9884	1.333	4	.8558
4*	.0105	4.12	99.52	.1018	: 4	.9988	.141	1	.7078
5*	.00123	.48	100.00	.0350	:				

* MARKS THE 5 CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS REMAINING IN THE ANALYSIS.

Table 3
Function and Structure Coefficients

STANDARDIZED CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS

	FUNC 1	FUNC 2	FUNC 3	FUNC 4	FUNC 5
PURPIS	.32100	-.66899	-.48274	.49358	1.12797
CRITIS	.39403	.71878	-.67644	.35577	-.98186
TEACIS	.66966	.20244	.01770	-.72491	.45652
RESIS	-.82287	.66254	.18380	.00210	.59670
USESIS	.11855	-.08936	1.30101	.25791	-.52293

STRUCTURE MATRIX:
(VARIABLES ORDERED BY SIZE OF CORRELATION WITHIN FUNCTION)

	FUNC 1	FUNC 2	FUNC 3	FUNC 4	FUNC 5
TEACIS	.67650*	.47731	.18927	-.39871	.34604
RESIS	-.21043	.77507*	.19559	.31888	.46374
CRITIS	.46405	.65722*	-.13205	.57677	-.05116
USESIS	.42440	.25868	.67671*	.53604	.08770
PURPIS	.43821	.08882	.01872	.74325*	.49730

Table 4
Classification Analysis Results

ACTUAL GROUP	NO. OF CASES	PREDICTED GROUP MEMBERSHIP 1	2	3	4	5	6
GRP 1 ARTS	7	1 14.3%	2 28.6%	1 14.3%	2 28.6%	0 .0%	1 14.3%
GRP 2 BUSINESS	12	1 8.3%	3 25.0%	3 25.0%	3 25.0%	0 .0%	2 16.7%
GRP 3 ED AND PSYCH	25	5 20.0%	1 4.0%	6 24.0%	4 16.0%	6 24.0%	3 12.0%
GRP 4 HEALTH/HUM SCI	26	6 23.1%	5 19.2%	3 11.5%	6 23.1%	2 7.7%	4 15.4%
GRP 5 LIBERAL ARTS	27	6 22.2%	2 7.4%	2 7.4%	5 18.5%	2 7.4%	10 37.0%
GRP 6 SCI/TECH	24	2 8.3%	2 8.3%	1 4.2%	3 12.5%	5 20.8%	11 45.8%
UNGROUPED CASES	8	1 12.5%	2 25.0%	0 .0%	4 50.0%	0 .0%	1 12.5%

PERCENT OF "GROUPED" CASES CORRECTLY CLASSIFIED: 23.97%